	Applicant	Initiated Intervi	ew Request I	Form	
Application No.: 10/ Examiner: A. Bayat		amed Applicant: L Art Unit: 2624	iu Status of App	olication:_Pend	ing
Tentative Participa (1) Richard Lyon, R	nts: eg. No. 37,385	(2) Examiner A. Bay	/at		
(3)		(4)			
Proposed Date of In	nterview: 11/13/07	Proposed T	ime: 2:00PM (EST)	(AM/PM)	
Type of Interview I (1) [X] Telephonic		al (3) [] Vide	o Conference		
		ed: []YES	-/4		·
		Issues To Be Di	scussed		
Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) Rejection (103)	1, 4, 7-8 and 10- 12	Rico/Carson	[]	[]	[]
(2)Rejection (103)	5-6	Rico/Carson/Itagaki	[]	[]	[]
(3)			[]	[]	[]
(4)			[]	[]	[]
[] Continuation Sh	neet Attached				
Brief Description o	of Arguments to be	Presented:			
(See attached ag	enda)				
	onducted on the a	bove-identified appl	ication on		·
§ 713.01). This application will	not be delayed fron	cant and submitted to to the same because of application to the statement of	icant's failure to s	ubmit a written	record of this
(Applicant/Applicar	nt's Representative	Signature) (Ex	aminer/SPE Sign	ature)	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

AGENDA FOR EXAMINER INTERVIEW FOR S/N 10/660,819

- 1) The 103 Rejections based on Rico
- (a) Rico teaches determining thicknesses, normalizing thickness values and histogramming pixel intensity values (which purportedly can be converted to thickness values). However, these steps are never performed on or for the same object. The thicknesses of a three-dimensional triangular phantom are determined, and used to with a mammogram of a breast phantom to create a phantom thickness map object. The values of this phantom thickness map object are normalized to the thickness readout of the mammographic system. But, the only histogram computed in the Rico scheme involves a digital mammogram of a women's breast—which is unrelated to either of the aforementioned phantoms.

Accordingly, if the object is the breast phantom or the three-dimensional triangular phantom, then Rico does not teach the claimed feature of "generating a thickness histogram for the object from the normalized values", as a histogram is never computed for either of these phantoms. And, if on the other hand, it is supposed that the breast imaged in the digital mammogram is the claimed object, then Rico does not teach either of the claimed features of "determining the thickness of the object along each of a prescribed number of parallel rays directed through the object in the direction under consideration" or "normalizing the determined thickness values of the object". This is because the only thickness determination along rays through an object and normalizing of thickness values taught in Rico involve the aforementioned phantoms.

(b) If Claim 1 was amended to read "determining the thickness of the object along each of a prescribed number of parallel rays directed through the object in the direction under consideration, normalizing the determined thickness values of the object, and generating a thickness histogram for the object from the normalized values" would this clarify the difference between the claimed object representation process and the process taught in Rico, as described above.